

WTWG Minutes for Monday, January 9, 2006 at 1:30 PM

Stuart Crane	Phil Crane
Patrick Deneen	Rick Dieker
Stephen Fanciullo	Ernest Gasseling
Chuck Garner	Perry Harvester
Ken Hasbrouck	Carron Helberg
Stan Isley	Chris Lynch
Larry Martin	Joe Mentor
Jim Milton	Kelly McCaffrey
Lisa Pelly	Roberta Ries
Tom Ring	Tom Tebb
Michael Tobin	Ron Van Gundy

Chuck Garner called the meeting to order at 1:30 AM. The previous minutes were reviewed, comments received, and corrected. CG made a motion to approve the minutes and it was seconded and passed.

The group commented that the previous transfer for Mr. and Mrs. Kollmorgen, 2005-57, had been approved by Ecology. The group also commented on the next previous transfer, 2005-64 (WY06) for the Ste. Michelle Wine Estates, and that the discussion of this proposal will continue at a later meeting.

The group continued with the first new transfer for Cromarty (13), 2005-66 (WY06), with Kelly McCaffrey explaining that the group has seen this one before and summarized the proposal. Tom Ring asked if it was identical. KM said it is the same except the length is 5 years and the effective dates changed. The group recommended this proposal. KM also continued with the next new transfer for Cromarty (14), 2005-67 (WY06), with the group asking if this is the same as the previous one. Since it is, the group recommended this proposal as well.

The group continued with the next proposal for Brunson/Bull Canal Co, 2005-68 (WY06), with Phil Crane and Perry Harvester explaining the POD, which includes the benefits to fish with a choice of up to five tributaries. PH stated it needs a protocol to manage the water. PC said it is non-consumptive use, return flow. TR noted that one of the management team was missing on the proposal. RVG asked if the original water right allow this kind of flexibility. TR asked if it was water budget neutral. PH & PC discussed fish passage, that the amount of the diversion would not change, and that the water is diverted to the water user (who is more efficient) and then becomes return flow. Tom Tebb returned to TR's question about a member of the YN on the team. TR needed to talk to the YN. The group suggested withholding on a recommendation until TR talks with the YN. TR said he will get back to the group via email.

The group continued with the next new proposal for Brunson, 2005-69 (WY06), PC explained this proposal would fallow the land and that it has lots of tail water. Stan Isley commented that he comes up with half the CU and that the efficiency should not be in there. The calculation needs updating. After discussing the components of the

calculation, the group recommended this proposal once the corrections to the CU calculation are made.

The group continued with the discussion only proposal by the Washington River Conservancy North Yakima Conservation District of 11 water claims. Mike Tobin explained this future proposal and that several things need to happen at the same time involving various parties. The bottom line question is: Can we move the water? The group commented on the improvement in fish passage, water availability, these senior water rights holders would become less senior, storage water issues, and it seems to be TWSA neutral. SI said this is defined as a voluntary impairment. Rick Dieker suggested we save the cost of building fish screens and ladders. Joe Mentor asked does this redefine the box. JM also commented that the rules should be consistently applied. The issue is the use of storage water. TR asked is Wapatox different, is it a benefit to the public. JM said it is non-project water exchanged for project water. TR asked is the Wapatox treated differently. SI stated the global issue is what Joe is talking about, the contract between Reclamation and Ecology, being an Ag to Ag transfer.

The group then progressed into a discussion of the contracting issues with Roberta Ries and she is saying that there are so many questions still left to answer. She asked if this proposal is within the district boundaries. RD stated no they are not, but it is a change in point of diversion. The group continued to discuss the O&M charges; metering on both ends; the need for a contract so YTID could carry the water in their system; and the mechanics of implementing a contract. RVG feels a contract is an absolute necessity. The conservation district thanked the group for the discussion and appreciated their comments.

Chuck Garner asked the group if they have any additional comments on the Reclamation/Ecology contract. After a brief discussion, the group agreed to continue the discussion on the Reclamation/Ecology contract at the next meeting.

Larry Martin indicated that one of his proposals for the next possible meeting, if held a month later, would be too close to the court date of February 9th, so he suggested January 23rd for the next meeting. TR asked that the meeting be held in the morning due to a scheduling conflict. The group agreed the agenda should include LM's proposal (Scatter Creek), the Wapatox proposal, and an update on the Reclamation/Ecology contract.

Thus, the group agreed the next meeting date will be Monday, January 23, 2006 at 10:30 AM.

The group adjourned at 3:15 PM.